

Combining MCRG and Fourier Accelerated Langevin Algorithm

D. Espriu* and A. Travesset†
D.E.C.M., Facultat de Física and I.F.A.E.
Universitat de Barcelona
Diagonal, 647
E-08028 Barcelona

ABSTRACT

We study the implementation of Monte Carlo renormalization group (MCRG) in momentum space. This technique is most efficient when used in combination with a Fourier accelerated Langevin algorithm. As a benchmark we calculate the critical exponents ν and η in the vicinity of both the gaussian and the Wilson fixed point in $\lambda\phi_3^4$. The results are very competitive with alternative analytical methods and require a moderate computational effort only.

* e-mail: espriu@greta.ecm.ub.es

† e-mail: alex@greta.ecm.ub.es

1. Introduction

Montecarlo renormalization group[1] is a powerful technique to determine critical exponents in numerical simulations. In this paper we implement this technique in momentum space (as opposed to real space) in conjunction with a Fourier accelerated Langevin algorithm, used to generate the set of field configurations upon which the renormalization group transformation is performed. Our primary interest is its application to the crumpling transition in random surface models[2] but we have found the results for a Z_2 -symmetric, one-component, scalar field theory in 3 dimensions interesting in their own right since most MCRG studies have been performed with spin models. These results are reported here.

Fourier accelerated algorithms were introduced by Batrouni et al. [3]. The method uses a stochastic Langevin equation in momentum space, partially eliminating critical slowing down. Being already in momentum space it is natural to define a Kadanoff transformation there, discarding the high frequencies of the system and keeping the low frequencies, which are the relevant ones near criticality. The procedure is close in spirit to Wilson's original proposal[4] and it apparently avoids some difficulties that arise with some 'unphysical' renormalization group transformations in real space. The method we discuss also possesses the desirable property of being exact in the free case. And, last but not least, the present method delivers very accurate results for the critical exponents ν and η at the Wilson fixed point with little computational effort. Subleading exponents at the Wilson fixed point are of course harder to get and we do not have accurate values for them yet, but they do not seem to be hopelessly beyond reach.

2. Numerical Renormalization Group.

Just to fix the notation, let us briefly review the method. Our starting point is the bare action

$$S = \sum_{\alpha} \lambda_{\alpha}^b O_{\alpha}^b \quad (2.1)$$

If we perform a renormalization group transformation with a scale t we end up with a similar action, but with renormalized couplings and operators. The new couplings will be highly nonlinear functions of the old ones

$$\lambda_{\alpha}^r = F(\lambda_{\alpha}^b) \quad (2.2)$$

Near the fixed point we can linearize such function

$$\lambda_{\alpha}^r - \lambda_{\alpha}^* = \sum_{\beta} T_{\alpha\beta} (\lambda_{\beta}^b - \lambda_{\beta}^*) \quad T_{\alpha\beta} = \left(\frac{\partial \lambda_{\alpha}^r}{\partial \lambda_{\beta}^b} \right)_{\lambda^b = \lambda^*} \quad (2.3)$$

The largest eigenvalue λ_h of $T_{\alpha\beta}$ will give the critical exponent ν

$$\nu = \ln t / \ln \lambda_h \quad (2.4)$$

To compute $T_{\alpha\beta}$ we use the chain rule

$$\frac{\partial \langle O_{\gamma}^r \rangle}{\partial \lambda_{\beta}^b} = \sum \left(\frac{\partial \lambda_{\alpha}^r}{\partial \lambda_{\beta}^b} \right) \frac{\partial \langle O_{\gamma}^r \rangle}{\partial \lambda_{\alpha}^r} \quad (2.5)$$

The expectation value of a renormalized operator can be computed either directly with the renormalized action or, using the renormalization group transformation to express the renormalized operator in terms of the bare fields, with the bare action. Thus

$$\frac{\partial \langle O_\gamma^r \rangle}{\partial \lambda_\beta^b} = \langle O_\gamma^r O_\beta^b \rangle - \langle O_\gamma^r \rangle \langle O_\beta^b \rangle \quad (2.6)$$

$$\frac{\partial \langle O_\gamma^r \rangle}{\partial \lambda_\beta^r} = \langle O_\gamma^r O_\beta^r \rangle - \langle O_\gamma^r \rangle \langle O_\beta^r \rangle \quad (2.7)$$

All one needs is a set of statistically independent field configurations to determine these correlators and, in turn, $T_{\alpha\beta}$. MCRG has been most successful when applied to Ising spins in 2 and 3 dimensions[1,5]. See [6] for other applications.

The Kadanoff transformation is largely arbitrary. We shall consider a transformation with $t = 2$, reducing the volume of our system from $N = n_1 \times n_2 \times \dots \times n_d$ points to $N_s = n_1/2 \times n_2/2 \times \dots \times n_d/2$. The renormalization group transformation we will use to achieve this volume reduction will be a decimation in momentum space. At each step we will simply discard the high p modes. This transformation is very easy to implement numerically and it has many advantages, as it will be clear in what follows.

A renormalization group transformation is not just a Kadanoff transformation. It also involves a field rescaling because redefinitions of the fields entering in the action make the function (2.2) ambiguous. We must pick an operator (usually the kinetic term) to have a definite normalization which will be preserved. Let us work out this rescaling. For a free theory the action is

$$S = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{x,\mu} (\phi(x) - \phi(x + \hat{\mu}))^2 + \frac{m^2}{2} \sum_x \phi(x)^2 \quad (2.8)$$

We set the lattice spacing equal to 1 and assume a hypercubic lattice in d dimensions. Define

$$\phi(x) = \frac{1}{N} \sum_p \exp(-ip\vec{x}) \phi(p) \quad (2.9)$$

then

$$S = \frac{1}{2N} \sum_p \phi(-p) \left(2d - 2 \sum_{\mu=1}^d \cos p_\mu + m^2 \right) \phi(p) \quad (2.10)$$

We now discard the modes with $|p_\mu| > \pi/2$ and re-express the action in real space via (2.9), but on the small lattice of size $N_s = N/2^d$. The result is [4]

$$S = \frac{1}{2} \frac{N_s}{4N} \sum_{x,\mu} (\phi(x) - \phi(x + \hat{\mu}))^2 + \frac{m^2}{2} \frac{N_s}{N} \sum_x \phi(x)^2 \quad (2.11)$$

To get the same kinetic term we need to redefine $\phi(x) = \zeta \phi(x)$ where $\zeta = 1/2^{(d+2)/2}$. Then the only other renormalized coupling—the mass—is $m_r^2 = 4m^2$, as expected.

In an interacting theory we cannot determine the rescaling ζ exactly. We shall write $\zeta = 1/2^{(d+2-\eta)/2}$ where η is the deviation in the scaling of the kinetic term with respect to the free case. Provided we are close enough to a fixed point, η is the anomalous dimension of the field ϕ .

We shall determine ζ (and, consequently, η) selfconsistently by demanding that observables computed with the bare and renormalized actions should coincide. The results are quite sensitive to the value of η . Departures from the correct value will quickly lead to unacceptable values for the eigenvalues of the T matrix (very large, complex, ...).

3. The Fourier Accelerated Langevin Algorithm (FALA).

One alternative to (partially) beat critical slowing down in Monte Carlo methods is to use the Langevin equation to construct a random walk in configuration space

$$\phi(x, t_{n+1}) = \phi(x, t_n) + \Delta\phi(x, t_n) \quad (3.1)$$

$$\Delta\phi(x) = -\Delta t \sum_y \epsilon(x, y) \frac{\delta S}{\delta\phi(y, t_n)} + \sqrt{\Delta t} \eta(x, t_n) \quad (3.2)$$

where $\eta(x, t)$ is a gaussian noise satisfying

$$\langle \eta(x, t) \eta(y, t') \rangle = 2\delta_{t, t'} \epsilon(x, y) \quad (3.3)$$

In momentum space the Langevin equation reads

$$\phi(p, t_{n+1}) = \phi(p, t_n) - \Delta t \epsilon(p) \mathcal{F} \frac{\delta S}{\delta\phi(y, t_n)} + \sqrt{\Delta t \epsilon(p)} \eta(p, t_n) \quad (3.4)$$

and

$$\langle \eta(p_1, t) \eta(p_2, t') \rangle = 2\delta_{t, t'} \delta p_1, -p_2 \quad (3.5)$$

Given infinite computer resources $\epsilon(p)$ is irrelevant. Any will do. However, to beat critical slowing down a physically motivated choice is called for. For the free theory, using $\epsilon(p) = D(p, m)$ (D is the free lattice propagator) is the optimal choice—all modes are updated at the same rate[3]. We expect that in the interacting case a good choice will be $\epsilon(p) = D(p, 1/\xi)$, where ξ is the correlation length in units of the lattice spacing.

One point to worry about is that for finite Δt the equilibrium distribution is not the one corresponding to S but rather to

$$S_{eq} = S + \frac{1}{4} \sum_{xy} \Delta t \epsilon(x, y) \left(\frac{\delta^2 S}{\delta\phi(x) \delta\phi(y)} - \frac{\delta S}{\delta\phi(x)} \frac{\delta S}{\delta\phi(y)} \right) + \mathcal{O}(\Delta t)^2 \quad (3.6)$$

Our action S will just be (2.8) with the additional term

$$\frac{\lambda}{4} \sum_x \phi(x)^4 \quad (3.7)$$

The finiteness of the Langevin step induces a systematic error of $\mathcal{O}(\Delta t)$ in S_{eq} . For instance, the bare mass gets renormalized by an amount that is approximately linear in Δt . We would therefore be inclined to use a value for Δt as small as possible, but this requires longer runs to reduce the statistical error.

The latter can be estimated as $\sqrt{2\tau/N_i}$, N_i being the total number of Langevin iterations, fixed by budgetary constraints, and τ being the autocorrelation time, fixed by Δt , but depending on the model dynamics too. For the free theory $\tau \sim 1/\Delta t$ (the actual proportionality constant depends on the normalization of $\epsilon(p)$). Away from the critical point this relation will hold for the interacting theory too; the autocorrelation time will be proportional to $(\Delta t)^{-1}$ and approximately λ independent. However, as we approach criticality the proportionality constant in the autocorrelation time will grow as ξ^z (ξ being the correlation length). For local Monte Carlo algorithms $z = 2$, while FALA are ‘optimal’ having $z = 0$ for multicomponent scalar theories. In our case, one-component scalar $\lambda\phi^4$, the presence of a discrete move $\phi \rightarrow -\phi$ degrades the performance to $z \simeq 1 - 2[7]$. The behaviour of the autocorrelation time is shown in Fig. 1. The difficulty with the discrete move will be absent in most applications.

Adding the two errors in quadrature we get that the optimal Langevin time step is proportional to $N_i^{-1/3}$. Trial and error also leads to Langevin steps in rough agreement with this scaling. A possibility to decrease the systematic error is to use a second order Langevin algorithm effectively removing the $\mathcal{O}(\Delta t)$ corrections from S_{eq} . The resulting code is of course slower, poorer statistics partially making up for any gains in precision. Our conclusion after some preliminary runs is that it hardly pays to use a second order algorithm.

4. The Gaussian Fixed Point.

This corresponds to the point $\lambda = 0$, $m^2 = 0$. Since we set $\lambda = 0$ from the start, the results we will present are trivial to obtain analytically, but they are a test that any MCRG method should pass. Autocorrelations are reduced completely (i.e. $\tau \simeq 1$) if $\Delta t \simeq 5 \times 10^{-2}$ (even though such big Langevin step induces a renormalization on the fields and the mass itself). We have checked that Wick’s theorem is satisfied with very good accuracy. 10 bins with 5×10^3 configurations per bin were enough to get accurate results. We have used a lattice of volume 32^3 reducing it to 16^3 . The rule-of-thumb for Δt previously discussed suggests $\Delta t = 7 \times 10^{-4}$ which is the value we have used. The operators we have considered are $O_n(\phi) = \sum_x \phi(x)^{2n}$. and their respective dispersions $\sigma(O_n)$. No ‘derivative’ operators were considered at this stage.

A first application of the algorithm taking $m^2 = 10^{-3}$ gives the results shown in Table 1. We can extract the critical exponent $\nu = .5027(30)$ (exact $\nu = .5$). The second eigenvalue is not very accurate. If we are very near a fixed point the renormalized and bare action are the same so averages of observables should coincide, that is $\langle O_n^b \rangle = \langle O_n^r \rangle$. In this way, by fitting some observables, we can get the anomalous dimension η . In our case, including an anomalous dimension worsens the agreement, so we take $\eta = 0$.

If we gradually approach the critical point by letting $m^2 \rightarrow 0$ the observables match and the subleading critical exponents agree with their exact values (Tables 3 and 4). Our best result for the critical exponent is $\nu = .5004(5)$. Going to much smaller masses is

problematic due to finite size effects. The results are remarkably stable with respect to the addition or removal of higher dimensional operators. The lesson we extract from this simple example is that it is easy to get the first eigenvalue right, but to get the subleading critical exponents one must be very close to the fixed point.

The errors quoted in the critical exponents are overwhelmingly dominated by systematic effects due to the truncation of the bare and renormalized actions. Statistical errors are negligibly small in all cases presented. Errors due to the fact that $S_{eq} \neq S$ are naively expected to cancel out in universal quantities. However, regarding this point one must keep in mind that, because a finite Langevin step modifies in practice the action of the system, S_{eq} is no longer at the gaussian fixed point. Then matching between bare and renormalized expectation values is no longer guaranteed (of course, since Δt is very small, the matching is excellent for $m^2 = 10^{-5}$, but not perfect). For this reason, including many operators in the renormalized action does not automatically improve the results; it may actually slightly worsen them because small errors in the highest dimensional operators eventually affect the precision of the largest eigenvalues. Finally, errors due to finite size effects do not seem to be relevant for these values of m^2 .

Table 1: $m^2 = 10^{-3}$, $\lambda = 0$		
Operators	1 eigen	2 eigen
1	3.993	—
2	3.977	1.688
3	3.972	1.775
4	3.964	1.731
5	3.967	1.731
6	3.967	1.731
7	3.964	1.784
8	3.967	complex
exact	4.000	2.000

Table 2: $m^2 = 10^{-3}$, $\lambda = 0$		
O_n/N	big lat.	small lat.
1	0.259	0.219
2	0.202	0.144
3	0.262	0.157
4	0.475	0.239
5	1.104	0.465
6	3.141	1.103
7	10.59	3.077
8	41.47	9.800

Table 3: $m^2 = 10^{-5}$, $\lambda = 0$				
Op.	1 eig	2 eig	3 eig	4 eig
1	3.999	——	——	——
2	3.997	2.003	——	——
3	3.994	2.005	1.003	——
4	3.994	1.985	1.003	0.402
5	3.993	1.999	0.999	0.551
6	3.994	1.989	1.019	0.553
7	3.994	1.998	0.964	0.584
8	3.994	2.002	0.930	0.620
exact	4.000	2.000	1.000	0.500

Table 4: $m^2 = 10^{-5}$, $\lambda = 0$		
O_n/N	big lat.	small lat.
1	0.304	0.308
2	0.275	0.274
3	0.410	0.400
4	0.850	0.775
5	2.242	1.935
6	7.150	5.800
7	26.65	20.70
8	113.8	88.27

5. The Wilson Fixed Point

The critical exponents in the vicinity of this fixed point are not known exactly. There are many different approaches giving reasonably precise estimates of the exponents, ϵ expansion [8], High T_c [9], exact Renormalization group treatments [10] and MCRG analysis [5,11]. The evidence accumulated suggest that no other fixed point exists and give an average estimate for the exponents

$$\nu = 0.627 - 0.631 \quad \eta = 0.03 - 0.04 \quad (5.1)$$

As we have discussed in section 3 even using a FALA does not completely suppress critical slowing down all the way to $z = 0$ in the particular example we are considering. To guarantee sound statistics we accumulated $O(10^5)$ configurations in bins of 10^4 , until observables reach a plateau. We also measure autocorrelation times. Since the proportionality constant relating τ and Δt can be large near the fixed point, the Langevin step has to be relatively large. The compromise between statistical and systematic errors leads to $\Delta t \simeq 10^{-3}$. The observables get some small renormalization but universal quantities should be relatively unaffected.

We must fine tune the parameters $m^2 < 0$ and λ so that we are near the fixed point. For each $\lambda > 0$ there is a value $m_\lambda^2 < 0$ corresponding to the critical surface. Applying renormalization group transformations there would drive us to the fixed point. Unfortunately we cannot do that in the computer since near the critical surface the correlation length starts to diverge and finite size effects enter into the game. What we did is to perform numerical simulations for a fixed value of λ and then sweep over m^2 to find the critical surface. For this purpose we simulated systems with 16^3 , $16^2 \times 8$, 16×8^2 and 8^3 sites. (We were forced to study asymmetric lattices because fast Fourier transforms require the lattice sizes to be a power of 2.) In addition to measuring observables such as energy density, specific heat, magnetization, etc. we also determined the correlation length by fitting the long distance part of our measured Green functions to a propagator of the type $1/\Delta + \xi^{-2}$. Once the critical surface is located, a MCRG is performed at a value of m^2 in its vicinity, but where the correlation length is not too large for our lattice. MCRG is done on a 32^3 lattice so the renormalized lattice becomes 16^3 . We repeat this procedure for several λ values until we observe a near perfect match between the bare and renormalized actions. This will be the approximate location of the fixed point. Of course the true fixed point lives in an infinite-dimensional parameter space and we are simply getting as close to it as possible in the (λ, m^2) plane. Because the agreement between bare and renormalized expectation values at our approximate fixed point is good we conclude that the particular renormalization group transformation we are using has a fixed point not far from the (λ, m^2) plane.

To begin with, we consider only local operators. We study values of λ ranging from 0.1 to 20. For $\lambda = 0.1$ the first eigenvalue of the T matrix is 3.969, almost the one corresponding to the gaussian fixed point. For such range of parameters we are still in the domain of attraction of the gaussian fixed point. Then we increase λ gradually repeating the same strategy. The largest eigenvalue gradually changes. By the time we reach the region $5 < \lambda < 8$ observables in the big and small lattices match with an accuracy similar to the one around the gaussian fixed point. In fact, the best agreement is obtained around $\lambda = 6.5$ which we take as approximate location of the new fixed point. The agreement improves if we allow for a small anomalous dimension. Fitting the 5 lowest dimensional operators gives

$$\eta = 0.03 \pm 0.005 \quad (5.2)$$

The agreement between big and small lattices is illustrated in Table 5 for the case $\lambda = 6$ and Table 6 shows the results for the critical exponent ν . Our best estimate is

$$\nu = 0.628(5) \quad (5.3)$$

The error corresponds to the error in the eigenvalue. Notice that also in this case the agreement between expectation values deteriorates for the highest dimensional operators. This is again a reflection that our bare action (which contains only three operators) is not quite at the fixed point, just close to it. Both ν and η are in perfect agreement with the ones obtained in [5,8-11]. If we keep increasing λ we are still in the domain of attraction of the wilsonian fixed point, but we are unable to match observables in the big and small lattices, even by fitting an anomalous dimension. Fixing $\eta = 0.04$ we get $\nu = 0.630(5)$ for

$\lambda = 10.$, still in agreement with the value obtained previously. Table 7 shows the big/small lattice comparison for $\lambda = 10.$ with $\eta = 0.$

Table 5: $m^2 = -3.32$, $\lambda = 6$		
O_n/N	big lat.	small lat.
1	0.272	0.267
2	0.161	0.160
3	0.130	0.133
4	0.130	0.140
5	0.151	0.173
6	0.187	0.240
7	0.260	0.380
8	0.402	0.650

Table 6: ν for different λ		
λ	ν	error
5.0	0.623	0.006
6.0	0.628	0.007
6.5	0.628	0.006
7.0	0.628	0.005
7.5	0.629	0.005

Table 7: $m^2 = -4.94$, $\lambda = 10.$ $\eta = 0.$		
O_n/N	big lat.	small lat.
1	0.238	0.185
2	0.120	0.087
3	0.080	0.061
4	0.067	0.055
5	0.063	0.059
6	0.066	0.073
7	0.076	0.101
8	0.093	0.153

We also explored the range of λ values up to 20., but the matching gets much worse and we eventually hit convergence problems of the Langevin algorithm. It is also important to stress that no evidence for another fixed point was found, and even for the high values of λ available the results are in the domain of attraction of the wilsonian fixed point.

The method delivers ν (and η) with good precision. Unfortunately, the second eigenvalue at $\lambda = 6.5$ is 0.3, which corresponds to $\omega = 1.7$, far from the accepted result [10], but these are subleading effects. One should really get much closer to the fixed point to be sensitive to these.

It is very important to check the stability of our results under the inclusion of ‘derivative’ operators. Exact renormalization group treatments did not include them in their first studies[10a], but some recent ones do indeed include some[10b]. We can consider their effect by including operators of the kind

$$V_n = \sum_{x,\mu} (\phi(x) - \phi(x + \hat{\mu}))^2 \phi(x)^{2n} \quad (5.3)$$

We carefully studied the inclusion of these operators up to $n = 6$ in the computation of the T matrix in the range $5 < \lambda < 8$, but the first eigenvalue did not change at all. However the second eigenvalue changed significantly to $\lambda = .82$ (that is $\omega = .28$), now undershooting the generally accepted value which is $\omega = .5 - .7$. Again the situation in the gaussian fixed point repeats itself, it is relatively easy to get the first eigenvalue right but the second one needs being very close to the corresponding fixed point.

6. Final Remarks.

We single out three avenues along which the method could be improved.

(1) Iteration of the renormalization group: This would require using a bigger lattice. On, say, a 64^3 lattice one could perform two successive renormalization group transformations. This would surely improve the matching amongst observables further. In principle, if our initial bare action is very close to the critical surface, iteration would bring us closer to the true fixed point. In practice, however, we cannot be too close to the critical surface due to finite size effects and while we certainly expect an improvement on our results after iteration this will not be a dramatic one, probably. In fact, we find remarkable that our approach yields such accurate results with so little effort.

(2) Determination of the renormalization group flow trajectories: The method as it stands so far is not accurate enough to determine the renormalized couplings. One possibility would be to use the method suggested in [12]. Another one would require a combination of MCRG techniques with a Ferrenberg-Swendsen[13] algorithm. The idea is to use the Ferrenberg-Swendsen method to perform a numerical simulation in the small lattice at a value of the parameters where already accurate results are found, storing as many operators as possible. Now apply MCRG paying special attention to the observables that have been stored. Then we can compute the observables for values of the couplings different from the actual one used in the simulation, and choose the couplings that best fit the observables. The couplings define the renormalized action.

(3) Improving the accuracy of subleading exponents: The fixed point needs to be located rather precisely, which can be done with the help of the renormalization group trajectories. Bigger lattices should also improve results because then we can get closer to the critical surface.

Our results were obtained with very modest computer resources. All calculations have been carried out on a IBM Power PC 250. Once the approximate location of the fixed point is found, the MCRG from a 32^3 to a 16^3 system, measuring 14 operators in 10^5 iterations takes around 50 hours and delivers critical exponents with a $\sim 1\%$ precision. All the evidence shows that the method is indeed efficient to study the renormalization group in the lattice. Our estimates for the critical exponents obtained with quite small

lattices are in perfect agreement with the ones computed by other methods. We think that the algorithm is well suited to study more difficult systems (N -component ϕ^4 would be interesting). The application to the crumpling transition in random surfaces is now under way.

Acknowledgements.

It is a pleasure to acknowledge discussions with A.Gonzalez-Arroyo, J.I.Latorre and E.Moreno. We would like also to thank J.Garcia-Ojalvo for supplying the gaussian random number generator. A.T. acknowledges a Fellowship from the Generalitat of Catalonia. This work has been supported by contracts CHRX-CT93-0343 and AEN93-0695.

References.

- [1] R.H.Swendsen, Phys. Rev. Lett. 42 (1979) 859; R.H. Swendsen, in "Real space renormalization", T. Burkhard and J. Van Leeuwen ed., Springer Verlag.
- [2] P.W. Stephenson and J.F. Wheeler, Phys. Lett. B 302 (1993) 447; J.F. Wheeler, Oxford Preprint OUTP-95-07-P
- [3] G.G. Batrouni et al, Phys. Rev.D 32 (1985) 2736
- [4] K. Wilson and J. Kogut, Phys. Rep. 12 (1974) 75
- [5] G.S. Pawley, R.H. Swendsen, D. J. Wallace and K.G. Wilson, Phys Rev. B 29 (1984) 4030; C.F. Baillie, K.W. Barnish, R. Gupta and G.S. Pawley, Nucl. Phys. B (proc. supp.) 17 (1990) 323
- [6] C. Rebbi and R.H. Swendsen, Phys. Rev. B21 (1980) 4094; P. Harten and P. Suranyi, Nucl. Phys. B 265 (1986) 615; A. Hasenfratz et al., Phys. Lett. B 140 (1984) 76; K. Bowler et al., Nucl. Phys. B 257 (1985) 155; R. Gupta et al., Phys. Lett. B 211 (1988) 132; K. Akemi et al. Phys. Rev. Lett. 71 (1993) 3063; U. Heller, Phys. Rev. Lett. 60 (1988) 2235; A.Gonzalez-Arroyo, M. Okawa and Y. Shimizu, Phys. Rev. Lett. 60 (1988) 487
- [7] A.D. Sokal, Nucl. Phys. B (proc. supp.) 20 (1991) 55
- [8] J. Zinn-Justin and J.C. Le Guillou, Phys. Rev. B21 (1980) 3976; G. Parisi, J. Stat. Phys 23 (1980) 49
- [9] C. Domb, in "Phase transition and critical phenomena", Vol 3, C. Domb and M. Green, Academic Press.
- [10a] A. Hasenfratz and P. Hasenfratz, Nucl. Phys. B270 (1986) 687; P.E. Haagensen, Yu. Kubyshin, J.I. Latorre and E. Moreno, Phys. Lett. B 323, 330 (1994); T. R. Morris, Int. Jour. Mod. Phys. A9 (1994) 2411; M. Alford, Phys. Lett. B 336 (1994) 2411
- [10b] G.R. Golner, Phys Rev. B 33 (1986) 7863; T.R. Morris, Phys. Lett. B 329 (1994) 241; R. Ball, P. Haagensen, J.I. Latorre and E. Moreno Phys. Lett. B 347 (1995) 80
- [11] D.J.E. Callaway and R. Petronzio, Nucl. Phys. B 240 [FS12] 577 (1984)
- [12] A. Gonzalez-Arroyo and M. Okawa, Phys. Rev. D35 (1987) 672
- [13] A. Ferrenberg and R.H. Swendsen, Phys. Rev. Lett. 61, 2635 (1988)

Figure Caption.-

Fig 1.- Autocorrelation time for the operator ϕ^2 at $\lambda = 6$. The Langevin step is $\Delta t = 0.001$. The system size is 16^3 .

